



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,456	12/04/2001	Michael Kagan	3891-0101P	9182
7590	09/25/2008		EXAMINER	
Mark M. Friedman Dr. Mark Friedman Ltd. c/o Discovery Dispatch 9003 Florin Way Upper Marlboro, MD 20772			DIVECHA, KAMAL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/000,456	KAGAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 31, 33, 39, 41-42, 44, 46-49, 64-66 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 3-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 31, 33, 39, 41-42, 44, 46-49, 64-66 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

This Action is in response to communications filed 7/15/08.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 31, 33, 39, 41-42, 44, 46-49, 64-66 are pending.

Claims 2, 10, 13, 15, 32, 40, 43, 45 and 60-63 were cancelled previously.

Claims 3 and 33 is cancelled in response filed 7/15/08.

**Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments in the submission filed on 7/15/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the communication, applicant argues in substance that:

- a. Neither Pettey nor Gasbarro teach, hint or suggest anything resembling the response descriptors recited in claims 1 and 31 (remarks, pg. 23, 24-26).

In response to argument [a], Examiner disagrees.

In the remarks, e.g. pg. 23, applicant asserts:

"For example, the way Pettey et al., handles an incoming RDMA Read request packet, which is an example of an incoming read request packets..."

If the received packet is an RDMA read request packet, then...Instead the RxPP logic forwards the received packet to the **TxPP logic for creation of an outgoing RDMA read response packet...The TxPP logic utilizes SGLs of fig. 9** to generate the transmit packets from..."

Applicant then asserts "in other words, Pettey handle...without creating and responding to a WQE or anything resembling a WQE".

However, applicant fails to note the usage of SGLs, i.e. scatter/gather lists.

Furthermore, applicant asserts that “similarly...Gasbarro...and not the responder of a RDMA operations posts a WQE”, e.g. remarks, pg. 24, 25, 26.

Examiner disagrees.

Gasbarro discloses (col. 12 L32 to col. 13 L36):

FIG. 6 illustrates an example host system using NGIO/InfiniBand™ and VI architectures to support data transfers via a switched fabric 100. As shown in FIG. 6, the host system 130 may include, in addition to one or more processors 202 containing an operating system (OS) stack 500, a host memory 206, and at least one host-fabric adapter (HCA) 120 as shown in FIGS. 2, 4A-4B and 5, a transport engine 600 provided in the host-fabric adapter (HCA) 120 in accordance with NGIO/InfiniBand™ and VI architectures for data transfers via a switched fabric 100. One or more host-fabric adapters (HCAs) 120 may be advantageously utilized to expand the number of ports available for redundancy and multiple switched fabrics.

As shown in FIG. 6, the transport engine 600 may contain a plurality of work queues (WQ) formed in pairs including a Receive Queue (“RQ” for inbound requests) and a Send Queue (“SQ” for outbound requests), such as work queue pairs (WQP) 610A-610N in which work requests “WQEs” may be posted to describe data movement operation and location of data to be moved for processing and/or transportation via a switched fabric 100, and completion queues (CQ) 620 may be used for the notification of work request completions. Alternatively, such a transport engine 600 may be hardware memory components of a host memory 206 which resides separately from the host-fabric adapter (HCA) 120 so as to process completions from multiple host-fabric adapters (HCAs) 120, or may be provided as part of kernel-level device drivers of a host operating system (OS). All work queues (WQs) may share physical ports into a switched fabric 100 via one or more host-fabric adapters (HCAs) 120.

Each work queue pair (WQP) can be programmed with various sized WQEs. Each WQE may be accessed to obtain control data supplied within. One of the control fields in the WQE may be a Data Segment. Data Segments are scatter

Art Unit: 2151

gather lists pointing to memory regions of system memory 206 where message data is to be transmitted from or where incoming message data is to be written thereto. WQEs can contain various amounts of Data Segments as long as the total does not exceed the programmed size of the WQE.

The Send Queue ("SQ" for outbound requests) of the work queue pair (WQP) may be used to as an "initiator" which requests, for example, normal message sends to remote VIs, remote direct memory access "RDMA" reads which request messages to be read from specific memory locations of a target system, via a switched fabric 100, and remote direct memory access "RDMA" writes which request messages to be written onto specific memory locations of a target system, via a switched fabric 100, as described with reference to FIGS. 3A-3D.

The Receive Queue ("RQ" for inbound requests) of the work queue pair (WQP) may be used as a "responder" which receives requests for messages from normal sends, RDMA reads and RDMA writes from a target system, via a switched fabric 100, as described with reference to FIGS. 3A-3D.

In such an example data network, NGIO/InfiniBand™ and VI hardware and software may be used to support data transfers between two memory regions, often on different systems, via a switched fabric 100. Each host system may serve as a source (initiator) system which initiates a message data transfer (message send operation) or a target system of a message passing operation (message receive operation). Examples of such a host system include host servers providing a variety of applications or services and I/O units providing storage oriented and network oriented IO services. Work requests in the form of "WQEs" (data movement operations such as message send/receive operations and RDMA read/write operations) may be posted to work queue pairs (WQPs) 610A-610N associated with a given fabric adapter (HCA), one or more channels may be created and effectively managed so that requested operations can be performed.

In other words, **the receive queue is used as responder which receives requests for messages from normal sends, RDMA reads, i.e. incoming RDMA requests and RDMA writes from a target system.**

**Work requests in form of WQEs** (data movement operations such as message send/receive operations and **RDMA read/write operations**) are posted to work queue pairs associated with a given fabric adapter HCA, whether it be incoming or outgoing work requests.

Furthermore, WQEs uses data segments which are **scatter gather lists pointing to memory regions of system memory where message data is to be transmitted from, i.e. uses posted WQEs to convey from where to transmit the data,** or where incoming message data is to be written thereto.

As such, it's clearly seen that Gasbarro posts WQEs in response to both the incoming and outgoing requests, acting as both the requestor and responder utilizing the WQEs.

For the at least these reasons, the REJECTION IS MAINTAINED.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 31, 34-39, 41-42, 44, 46-49 and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pettey et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,594,712 B1) in view of Gasbarro et al. (hereinafter Gasbarro, U. S. Patent No. 6,948,004 B2).

As per claim 1, Pettey discloses a network interface adapter, comprising:  
a host interface for coupling to a host processor (fig. 2 item #206, fig. 18b item #308);  
an outgoing packet generator for delivery to a remote responder responsive to a request submitted by the host processor via the host interface col. 7 L65 to col. 8 L7, col. 14 L20-39, fig. 3 item #306);

a network output port, coupled to receive the request packet from the output packet generator, so as to transmit the outgoing request packet over a network to the remote responder (col. 9 L1-5, fig. 3 item #308);

a network input port, for coupling to the network so as to receive an incoming response packet from the remote responder, in response to the outgoing request packet sent thereto, and further to receive an incoming request packet sent by a remote requester (fig. 3 item #308 and fig. 2 item #204);

an incoming packet processor, coupled to the network input port so as to receive and process both the incoming response packet and the incoming request packet, and further coupled to cause the outgoing packet generator, responsive to the incoming request packet, to generate in addition to the outgoing request packet, an outgoing response packet for transmission via the network output port to the remote requester (col. 10 L4-9, col. 14 L40-54 and fig. 3 item #306),

wherein the outgoing request packet comprises an outgoing write request packet containing write data taken from a system memory accessible via the host interface (fig. 18a: describes the process of RDMA WRITE operation; fig. 16 shows the I/O WRITE operation),

wherein the outgoing response packet comprises an outgoing read response packet containing read data taken from the system memory in response to the incoming request packet (fig. 18a and fig. 16) and a scatter/gather list created by CPU (fig. 9), and

wherein the incoming request packet comprises an incoming read request packet specifying data to be read from a system memory accessible via the host interface (fig. 15: describes an incoming read request packet, and col. 11 L17-67, col. 13 L58 to col. 14 L9, L40-65 and col. 15 L65 to col. 16 L6);

wherein the incoming packet processor is adapted to write a response descriptor to a first memory location, in a memory separate from the network interface adapter, indicating the data to be read from the system memory responsive to the incoming read request packet (col. 14 L10-67, fig. 2 item #218, fig. 7B: the WQE are stored in local memory, separate from the TCA, and col. 25 L10-26);

wherein the outgoing packet processor is adapted to read the response descriptor from the first memory location and, responsive thereto, to read the indicated data and to generate outgoing response packet containing the indicated data (col. 9 L1-5, col. 11 L54 to col. 12 L67, col. 22 L39-67).

wherein to submit the request, the host processor writes a request descriptor indicative of the write data to a second memory location, (this approach is known as double buffering, col. 11 L18 to col. 12 L45 and fig. 7b).

However, Pettey does not explicitly disclose the process of gathering both the write data and the read data from the system memory for inclusion in the respective outgoing packets and a process adapted to read information from the descriptors and to gather the read data and the write data responsive thereto. .

Gasbarro, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses an interface adapter (fig. 7) comprising a gather engine providing a gather list describing virtual addresses to fetch outgoing whether it's a read or write data from local system memory for inclusion in the outgoing packets (col. 8 L10-34, col. 11 L14-45, col. 12 L64 to col. 13 L5, col. 13 L5 to col. 14 L28, col. 15 L20-67, col. 21 L16-56: please also note that it is the inherent function of the gather engine to gather the data in response to either write or read request regardless of incoming and

outgoing packets), a scatter/gather engine adapted to read information from the indicators or descriptors, i.e. WQEs and to gather or fetch the read data and the write data (col. 8 L28-41, col. 12 L32 to col. 13 L36).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey in view of Gasbarro, in order to gather both the write data and the read data from the system memory for inclusion in the respective outgoing packets, since Gasbarro teaches the process of gathering outgoing data from the system memory utilizing WQEs.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled the process of fetching outgoing data from system memory whether it's a read or write data, i.e. Data movement operation to/from (Gasbarro, col. 8 L28-34, col. 13 L1-32).

As per claim 4, Pettey discloses an interface adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises a plurality of schedule queues (fig. 7a block #108), and is adapted to generate the outgoing request packet (fig. 16) and the outgoing response packet responsive to respective entries placed in the queues (fig. 18a item #1808, 1822, fig. 22a item #2224, 2226 and fig. 15).

As per claim 5, Pettey discloses an interface adapter wherein the network input and output ports are adapted to receive and send the incoming and outgoing packets, respectively, over a plurality of transport service instances, and wherein the outgoing request packet and the outgoing response packet are associated with respective instances among the plurality of transport service instances (fig. 7a item #108), and wherein the outgoing packet generator is adapted to assign the transport service instances to the queues based on service parameters of the

instances, and to place the entries in the schedule queues corresponding to the transport service instances with which the incoming and outgoing packets are associated (col. 8 L2-26, col. 11 L1-36 and col. 14 L10-54 and col. 17 L20-40).

As per claim 6, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises one or more execution engines, which are adapted to generate the outgoing request packet and the outgoing response packet responsive to a list of work items respectively associated with each of the transport service instances (col. 1 L54 to col. 2 L21, col. 7 L65 to col. 8 L7, col. 11 L18-53), however Pettey does not disclose a scheduler, which is coupled to select the entries from the queues and to assign the instances to the execution engines for execution of the work items responsive to the service parameters.

Gasbarro discloses an adapter comprising a scheduler for scheduling the next virtual interface to the context manager and supporting priority of traffic for data packets associated with send Queue and Receive Queue of the work queue pair (col. 15 L50-58).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey in view Gasbarro, in order to include a scheduler for selecting the entries from the queues and to assign the instances to the execution engines for execution of the work items responsive to the service parameters.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because a scheduler would have supported the priority of traffic for data packets associated with Send queue and Receive queue of the work queue pair (Gasbarro, col. 15 L50-55).

As per claim 7, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the transport service instances comprise queue pairs (fig. 7a-7b: shows plurality of queues including queue pairs).

As per claim 8, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator comprises one or more control registers to which the host processor and incoming packet processor write in order to place the entries in the queues (Pettey, col. 17 L20-56), however Pettey does not explicitly disclose the one or more register to be a doorbell registers.

Gasbarro, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses a channel adapter comprising one or more doorbell registers (col. 15 L20-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey in view of Gasbarro, in order to replace the one or more control registers with the doorbell registers, since Gasbarro teaches and discloses the usage of doorbell registers.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because doorbell registers allows software the capability to enable automatic event generation, and making doorbell registers memory mapped allows applications the ability to write those registers thereby controlling event generation (Gasbarro, col. 15 L20-32).

As per claim 9, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming request packet comprises a write request packet carried over the network on a reliable transport service, and wherein responsive to the incoming write request packet, the incoming packet processor is adapted to add an entry to the entries placed in the queues, such that responsive to the entry, the outgoing packet generator generates an acknowledgement packet (col. 19 L55 to col. 20 L33).

As per claim 11, Pettey discloses the process of receiving a read request (fig. 15 item #1000); the process of receiving a write request (fig. 16 item #1000); and the process of conveying or sending the write data to the host interface (fig. 15 item #1100), however Pettey

does not disclose the process of receiving an incoming write request packet containing write data to be written to a system memory accessible via the host interface after receiving the incoming read request packet, and the process of conveying the write data to the host interface without waiting for execution of the response descriptor. But it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pettey (i.e. modify Pettey's figure 15 and 16 so that the incoming packet processor of the adapter (see the rejected claim 1) is configured so that the write request work queue entry is executed first with respect to read response work queue entry or response descriptor) in order to convey the write data to the host interface without waiting for execution of the read response work item, since Pettey teaches receiving incoming write request, receiving incoming read request packet, executing both of the requests, and conveying the write data to the host interface. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have improved the efficiency and enhanced the performance of the interface adapter.

As per claim 12, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming packet processor is configured so that when it receives an incoming write request packet containing write data to be written to a system memory accessible via the host interface before receiving the incoming read request packet, it prevents execution of the read response work item or response descriptor until the write data have been written to the system memory (col. 21 L12 to col. 22 L6).

As per claim 14, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the outgoing packet generator is adapted, upon generating the outgoing request packet, to notify the incoming packet processor to await the incoming response packet so as to write a completion message to the host interface when the awaited packet is received (col. 20 L17-32).

As per claim 16, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming read request packet is one of a plurality of incoming read request packets, and wherein the incoming packet processor is adapted to write a list of corresponding response descriptor to the first memory location each said response descriptor indicating the data to be read from the system memory responsive to the corresponding incoming read request packet, responsive to which the outgoing packet processor is adapted to generate the outgoing response packet as part of a sequence of such packets (fig. 19a, fig. 20 and fig. 9; col. 23 L20 to col. 24 L27; col. 11 L18-37, fig. 7b, fig. 2 and col. 14 L10-20).

As per claim 17, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the network input and output ports are adapted to receive and send the incoming and outgoing packets, respectively, over a plurality of transport service instances, and wherein the incoming packet processor is adapted to prepare the list of the response descriptors for each of the instances as a part of a response database held for the plurality of the instances in common (fig. 3 item #308, fig. 19b item #508, and fig. 23).

As per claim 18, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the transport service instances comprise queue pairs (fig 7a item #712).

As per claim 19, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the request comprises a write request, which is submitted by the host processor by generating a request descriptor indicating further data to be read from the system memory for inclusion in the outgoing packet (fig. 10), and wherein the output packet generator is adapted to read the request descriptor and, responsive thereto, to generate the outgoing request packet as a write request packet containing the indicated further data (fig. 18a item #1832; col. 12 L58 to col. 13 L18, col. 15 L17-31 and fig. 16).

As per claim 64, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the memory separate from the network interface is the system memory (fig. 2 item #218).

As per claim 65, Pettey discloses an adapter wherein the incoming read request packet is a RDMA read request packet and wherein the response descriptor is a quasi-WQE (Pettey: i.e. work item, fig. 7b, col. 11 L1-53; Gasbarro: col. 7 L33-67, col. 13 L15 to col. 14 L28).

As per claims 31, 34-39, 41-42, 44, 46-49 and 66, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1, 4-9, 11-12, 14-19 and 64-65. Therefore claims 31, 34-39, 41-42, 44, 46-49 and 66 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1, 4-9, 11-12, 14-19 and 64-65.

#### *Additional References*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Beukema et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,578,122 B2.
- b. Avery, U. S. Patent No. 6,611,883 B1.
- c. Thomas et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,922,046.
- d. Coffman et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,718,370 B1.

**Conclusion**

The teachings of the prior art should not be restricted and/or limited to the citations by columns and line numbers, as specified in the rejection. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

In the case of amendments, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and support, for ascertaining the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is (571)272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kamal Divecha  
Art Unit 2151  
/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151

<b>Application Number</b> 	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination
	10/000,456 Examiner KAMAL B. DIVECHA	KAGAN ET AL. Art Unit 2151